

per year. His appointment was by order in Council, dated 31st of May, 1895. He is allowed travelling expenses to Seine Centre, not to exceed \$10 per month, when he goes there to try cases.

Mr. Whitney—Is John I. Hobson in the service of the Government, and, if so, when did he enter the Government service? If not in the service of the Government now, has he been in that service in the past, and, if so, for what period? What has been the rate of and aggregate amount of remuneration received by the said John I. Hobson?

Mr. Davis replied:—“Mr. John I. Hobson is not in the service of the Government. In 1887 he was appointed a member of the Advisory Board of the Ontario Agricultural College. No meeting of the board has been held since 1894. His remuneration was \$4 per day, and during eleven years he has received \$213 30 for his services and expenses. Mr. Hobson has also addressed Farmers' Institute meetings at various times during the past ten years, for which service he has received the customary allowance, averaging \$49 70. He was also appointed a member of the Fees Commission, which held its sittings in the years 1894 and 1895. The remuneration was \$10 per day. The aggregate sum received for his services was \$1,200.”

Mr. Hodgins—Was a ram purchased by the Government from T. D. Hodgins within the last five years, and, if so, for what price? On whose recommendation was the purchase made?

To this question Mr. Davis replied:—“No ram was purchased by the Government from Mr. T. D. Hodgins during the last ten years, nor is there any record of a recommendation for such a purchase, or any correspondence relating thereto.”

At Mr. Whitney's suggestion the name of Hodgins was changed to John Glennie, and a fresh return will be secured.

#### London Normal School.

Mr. Hodgins moved for an address to his Honor the Lieutenant-Governor praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a return of copies of all orders in Council, correspondence and other documents relating to the deciding upon and purchase of a site in the City of London for the proposed Normal School. Speaking to the motion he stated that he had been requested by a large number of the citizens of London to bring this matter before the Legislature, and in doing so he had no other object than the best interests of the City of London. It was the desire of the citizens that the Normal School should be placed in a more central portion of the city than the site selected. He asked the Government to seriously consider the prayer of the petition of the City of London and to stay proceedings until there can be some attempt made to arrange the matter between the city and the Government. He had been requested to bring the matter up by very strong friends of the hon. member for London. He was assured that the corporation of the City of London would acquiesce in any arrangement by which a more convenient site would be adopted.

Hon. Geo. W. Ross reviewed the difficulties which had been encountered by the Government in selecting a suitable site at a reasonable figure for the Normal School at London. They found they could get a very small lot at a very large figure in the central portion of the city, and had accepted a very suitable site of four acres conveniently situated, with excellent means of communication, in London South for \$7,500. London South, he pointed out, has a school population of about 1,000, which is more than sufficient for Model School purposes. There are two large Public Schools nearby, the city is growing rapidly in this district and there is ample accommodation for the students. Those students who preferred to board at hotels, a practice which the Government had not encouraged, could find hotels within ten minutes' walk. The Normal School at Toronto when it was established was, he pointed out, further removed from the centre of the city than is the site of the London school, which will probably be the centre of a large population in a very short time. He had no objection to bring down the papers, which would convince the House that the Government had made a good selection.

#### Agricultural Farm Stock.

Mr. J. T. Hodgins moved for an order of the House for a return of copies of all correspondence relating to the purchase of a ram by the Government from John Glennie. Mr. Hodgins assigned as a reason for introducing the matter that during the last campaign he had been charged with being a boodler, it being asserted that he had sold a certain ram to the Government at an exorbitant figure. He described at some length the circumstances under which, in a process of weeding out his flock, he had disposed of the animal. Some time afterwards he recognized the cast-off animal at the Ontario Agricultural College farm and was informed that it had been purchased at a high figure. The animal was sold by him at a very low figure, or rather it was traded off, and he resented the charge of boodling, as he had not sold it to the Government. The animal was fit only for exhibition purposes, and he was informed that it was purchased by the Government at \$100 or \$150, and if this is the way the purchases are made for the college, the Government, the House and the country ought to know it.

Hon. Mr. Davis repeated his explanation that search had been made in the department respecting the purchase of a ram from T. D. Hodgins. He would have further search made in the light of the information now received and bring down the papers.

Mr. Whitney emphasized the point that the hon. member for East Middlesex had completely refuted the charges made against him during the campaign.

Dr. McKay (South Oxford) created some amusement by his references to the debt of gratitude which Mr. Hodgins owed to this alleged aged sheep, whose name, he informed the House, was “Dan,” and whose influence in the campaign had been of the greatest assistance to his former owner. His